

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment (SEMSA)

MSIP Year: 2001-2002

Report Summary: On-Site Visit

Total Number of Surveys:		Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC)			
Role of Person completing this survey:		Heart of Missouri-Columbia:	2	South Central Missouri:	3
Special Education Contact:	19	Southwest Missouri:	3	Southeast Missouri:	0
Superintendent:	0	Kansas City:	2	St. Louis:	0
Principal:	1	Northeast Missouri:	0	Central Missouri:	1
Other:	2	Northwest Missouri:	4		

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A. TRAINING/TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE					
1. SEMSA training workshops were helpful.	5	11	1	4	1
2. DESE provided timely and helpful responses to questions.	6	9	3	4	0
3. Compliance List Serv was helpful in answering questions.	5	5	11	1	0
B. WRITTEN INSTRUCTIONS					
4. SEMSA instruction guidelines were helpful.	3	11	3	3	2
5. SEMSA instruction guidelines were user friendly.	1	10	3	7	1
C. SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS					
6. Data required to complete the self-monitoring review was easily accessible.	2	11	2	6	1
7. Amount of time required to complete the review was reasonable.	1	9	0	8	4
8. Electronic submission of data is an efficient way to send SEMSA data to DESE.	6	6	8	2	0
9. SEMSA process increased understanding of compliance requirements for special education.	7	8	2	2	3
10. SEMSA process is an effective way to assess student performance for students w/ disabilities.	0	8	4	6	4
11. SEMSA process has made district/agency more aware of performance of students w/disabilities.	3	9	2	5	3
12. SEMSA process helped accurately evaluate performance of students w/ disabilities.	1	7	3	7	4
13. SEMSA process is an effective way to assess compliance with state/federal regulations.	6	10	2	2	2
14. Time spent on the SEMSA process was beneficial.	4	9	3	1	5
D. FINAL REPORT AND LETTER					
15. Received final monitoring report/letter in reasonable length of time.	2	7	1	5	7
16. Final report/letter were user friendly.	2	9	4	2	5
E. CORRECTIVE ACTION/IMPROVEMENT PLANNING					
17. District/agency is aware of its areas of non-compliance.	7	10	5	0	0
18. District/agency is aware of what it needs to do to correct any areas of non-compliance.	6	11	3	1	1
F. ON-SITE PREPARATION AND VISIT					
19. Preparation for the on-site monitoring accomplished in reasonable amount of time.	2	8	4	4	4
20. On-site monitoring was beneficial.	5	6	5	4	1
21. On-site monitoring conducted in an efficient and effective manner.	6	8	6	0	1
22. DESE staff conducting on-site monitoring were knowledgeable.	7	6	6	1	1
23. DESE staff conducting on-site monitoring were professional.	8	8	4	0	1
24. DESE staff conducting the on-site monitoring were helpful.	8	6	6	0	1

25. How many staff were involved in the SEMSA self-monitoring review process?

Special Educators: 298 Administrators: 54 Support Staff: 40 Others: 7

26. How many total hours did it take to complete the SEMSA Review and Reporting:

Less than 20 hours: 3 21 to 30 hours: 5 31 to 40 hours: 5 More than 40 hours: 9

27. Did staff request assistance from a DESE special education Compliance supervisor during the SEMSA process?

Yes 17 No 5

Questions 28-31 are addressed on a separate report.